

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,955	01/03/2001		Wolf-Gernot Drost	DROST ETAL-2	9023
7	590	02/04/2003			
Collard & Roe				EXAMINER	
1077 Northern Boulevard Roslyn, NY 11576				COLAIANNI, MICHAEL	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1731	G
				DATE MAILED: 02/04/2003	/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/720,955**

Applicant(s)

Drost et al.

Examiner

Michael Colaianni

Art Unit **1731**



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	
	for Reply	
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE3 MONTH(S) FROM
	sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In r	no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
- If the property - If NO property - Failure - Any re	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply an to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the	nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
earned Status	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	
1) X.	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 31, 20	
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) X This acti	
		en is now that. xcept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex par	
	tion of Claims	
4) X	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	(4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) X	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗀	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	ation Papers	
9) 🗀	The specification is objected to by the Examiner,	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)□	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	o this Office action.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13)🗶	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) [☑ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No
	application from the International Burea	
_	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	
14) 🗔	•	
	The translation of the foreign language provisiona	
15) 🗀	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. 33 12U and/or 121.
Attachm	nent(s) otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	6) Other:
73	•	

Application/Control Number: 09/720955 Page 2

Art Unit: 1731

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, uses the language "bigger" and "smaller" which is deemed to be relative terminology and indefinite.

Claim 1 also uses the language "in a way similar to that one in the first step" which is deemed to be indefinite because it is not clear what "similar" is meant to encompass. Is the process exactly the same or merely a variation on step one? How much of a variation?

Claim 2 refers to an additional deformation step which is preformed "in a way as described in the sixth step" which is indefinite because is not clear what "in a way" is meant to encompass.

Claim 3, refers to steps 1-5 being "multi-copied" "as long until the particles' size profile shows the specified broad distribution." This language is indefinite because it is not clear when such a profile would be attained because no "specified broad distribution" is "specified."

Claim 4 refers to the particles being redeformed into their "original" shapes in a "limited specific way." This is deemed to be indefinite. First, it is not clear what the "original" shape of

Application/Control Number: 09/720955

Art Unit: 1731

the particles was, so it is not clear what the particles are being redeformed into. Secondly, it is not clear what the "limited specific way" encompasses. No "limited specific way" is delineated.

Claim 5 refers to ions which are embedded, but it is not clear if these are the metal ions that are referred to in steps 1 and 4 or if steps 1 ions are different from step 4's ions.

Claim 7 refers to "the reduction process" but should also indicate that the reduction process is in step 2 of the process.

Claim 10 refers to the glass being stretched, but it is not clear if this stretching is meant to be the step 6, deforming step or a separate step.

Claim 11 refers to in "such continuous deforming process" which lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 11 also refers to "after drawing" which lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 12 refers to the "specific deformation" which is of confusing antecedent basis with the "deforming" in step 6 of claim 1. Is the "specific deformation" the deformation that is occurring in step 6?

Claim 13 refers to "such energy input" which lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 14, refers to "the glass surface" being masked which lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 15, refers to "such local energy input" and "such masking and etching" which lack antecedent basis.

Application/Control Number: 09/720955

Allowable Subject Matter

Page 4

3. Claims 1-15 will be allowed upon correction of the 112, 2nd Paragraph matters.

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none

of the prior art examined taught or fairly suggested the combination of steps as claimed in claim 1.

The closest piece of prior art, US Patent 3,637,453 which teaches multiple crystallization and

tempering steps but fails to teach or fairly suggest the claimed combination of steps in applicant's

claim 1.

Art Unit: 1731

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Michael Colaianni whose telephone number is 703-305-5493. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Steven Griffin, can be reached on (703) 308-1164. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7115.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Art Unit 1731 January 25, 2003

> MICHAEL COLAIANNI PRIMARY EXAMINER